UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social
Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/2000/SR.62
3 May 2000

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Fifty-sixth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 62nd MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 25 April 2000, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. SIMKHADA (Nepal)

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE SESSION (continued)

CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS, INCLUDING THE QUESTION OF:

(a) TORTURE AND DETENTION

(b) DISAPPEARANCES AND SUMMARY EXECUTIONS

(c) FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Commission at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.00-13467 (E)

CONTENTS (continued)

(d) INDEPENDENCE OF THE JUDICIARY, ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, IMPUNITY

(e) RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

(f) STATES OF EMERGENCY

(g) CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION TO MILITARY SERVICE (continued)

RACISM, RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, XENOPHOBIA AND ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION (continued)

SPECIFIC GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS:

(a) MIGRANT WORKERS

(b) MINORITIES

(c) MASS EXODUSES AND DISPLACED PERSONS

(d) OTHER VULNERABLE GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE SESSION (agenda item 3) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN read out the following statement on the question of resources for the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights:

> "On the occasion of the first session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights of a new century, we should all reaffirm our commitment to the essential work of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and recognize the need for further and continued support of the programmes and activities of the Office of the High Commissioner. This matter is of particular relevance given the new mandates the Commission is considering and the numerous existing ones.
>
> "For the first time, the Office of the High Commissioner has published an Annual Appeal which clearly demonstrates the extent of its commitments and at the same time highlights the critical need for support.
>
> "The Commission therefore reaffirms its appeal to the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly that additional resources be allocated to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, as already recommended in Commission resolutions 1998/83, 1999/54 and 2000/1, to ensure that all necessary financial, material and personnel resources are provided to the Office of the High Commissioner commensurate with its increasing tasks."

CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS, INCLUDING THE QUESTION OF:

(a) TORTURE AND DETENTION

(b) DISAPPEARANCES AND SUMMARY EXECUTIONS

(c) FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

(d) INDEPENDENCE OF THE JUDICIARY, ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, IMPUNITY

(e) RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

(f) STATES OF EMERGENCY

(g) CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION TO MILITARY SERVICE

(agenda item 11) (continued) (E/CN.4/2000/L.45/Rev.1 and L.58)

Draft resolution on promoting and consolidating democracy (E/CN.4/2000/L.45/Rev.1 and L.58)

2. Mr. MAXIM (Romania) said that no one had responded to his delegation's offer to hold consultations on the draft resolution and he therefore considered that action should be taken forthwith with respect to it. He requested that a roll-call vote be taken on the amendments to the draft resolution (E/CN.4/2000/L.58) which his delegation would vote against, since it considered that all meaningful amendments had already been incorporated into the draft resolution as revised (E/CN.4/2000/L.45/Rev.1).

3. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that his delegation had no problem with any of the changes incorporated into the revised draft resolution (E/CN.4/2000/L.45/Rev.1), although it considered that some of the proposals by the delegation of Cuba would have enriched the draft and made it more balanced. His delegation did, however, have a problem with the prescriptive nature of the draft resolution, which failed to recognize that there were many roads to democracy. His delegation had therefore been instructed to propose an amendment, namely, the insertion of a new paragraph 2, to read:

> "Acknowledges the principles of democracy and good governance enshrined in the Holy Koran and the Islamic Sharia which have been incorporated in the basic laws of a number of Member States."

Such a paragraph would safeguard and acknowledge the principles of democracy as practised in the Islamic world for over 1,400 years, and he hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would accept that amendment in a spirit of tolerance and mutual respect.

4. Mrs. de ARMAS GARCÍA (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the proposed amendments to the draft resolution (E/CN.4/2000/L.58), said that Zambia had been mistakenly included in the list of sponsors and that the representative of Qatar and the observer for Equatorial Guinea had become sponsors. The amendment proposed orally by the delegation of Pakistan was a valid one and should be incorporated into the draft resolution. The purpose of the proposed written amendments was to produce a balanced text that could serve as a general basis of principle for the promotion and consolidation of democracy, applicable to various systems and types of government, and would recognize the diversity that was at the heart of the United Nations.

5. In its current form, the draft resolution imposed a specific model of democracy to be followed by the Member States as well as a monitoring system. Unfortunately, the so-called open consultations had failed to take account of the most important proposals made by the large group on behalf of which she spoke, to whom it was not acceptable that a particular type of democracy should be made into a universal category.

6. She wished to draw the Commission's attention to a number of changes that had been made to the proposal she was introducing. Amendments Nos. 3, 8, 10, 11 and 12 had been withdrawn. In amendment No. 4, the words "third preambular paragraph" had been replaced by "sixth preambular paragraph", in amendment No. 6, the words "third preambular paragraph" had been replaced by "fourth preambular paragraph", and amendment No. 16 should read "delete operative paragraph 2".

7. She requested that separate action should be taken on each of amendments Nos. 1, 4, 5 and 7, and that joint action should be taken on amendments Nos. 2, 6, 9, 14, 15, 16 and 17.

8. Mr. KOH (United States of America) said that Commission resolution 1999/57 had established the fundamental relationship between democracy and universal human rights and reaffirmed the importance of democracy in promoting peace, prosperity and international stability. The draft resolution currently under consideration built on that resolution, giving further definition to that fundamental relationship and recognizing the importance of education, transparency, anti-corruption efforts and alternative dispute mechanisms in strengthening democratic institutions.

9. The text of the draft resolution had been fully aired before the Commission in a transparent and thorough consultative process. The representative of Pakistan had stated that there were many roads to democracy: all such roads had been recognized by the draft resolution in its reference to resolution 1999/57, which explicitly recognized the rich and diverse nature of the community of the world's democracies. The proposed amendments to the draft resolution (E/CN.4/2000/L.58) would request the United Nations Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on the matter of the promotion and consolidation of democracy. Those views were, however, already known. The proposed amendments did not therefore advance the cause of promoting democracy, but was an attempt to reverse the unanimous decision taken by the Commission in 1999 and to bypass the continuing work of many regional and international organizations to build democracy worldwide. He hoped that all those unnecessary amendments would be rejected by the Commission.

10. Mr. MAMBA (Swaziland) said that his delegation wished to withdraw its name from the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

11. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that his delegation acknowledged the contribution made by the United States delegation to the revised draft resolution (E/CN.4/2000/L.45/Rev.1). It was precisely because that text was such an important one that all delegations must examine it carefully in order to ensure that their own political systems were not compromised by the prescriptions it contained. He did not believe it appropriate for the fundamental principles of his own country's Constitution to be called into question by any Commission resolution. Democracy must not be seen as a clash of civilizations. He therefore urged that careful consideration be given to the proposed amendments.

12. Mr. HYNES (Canada) said that, since his delegation had had no advance notice of the amendment proposed orally by the representative of Pakistan, it had had no chance to consult the sponsors of the draft resolution. While the draft resolution did contain some prescriptions, they were very general, being largely restatements of the general principles of international humanitarian law. The amendment proposed by the representative of Pakistan, on the other hand, was very specific, and if adopted, would mean that the Commission would have to incorporate further amendments recognizing other systems in other parts of the world. His delegation was thus strongly opposed to that amendment.

13. With regard to the proposed written amendments to the draft resolution (E/CN.4/2000/L.58), he agreed with the statement by the United States representative that they

reflected no significant progress. Number 15, in particular, was not so much an amendment as an attempt to gut the draft resolution. His delegation would therefore vote against the proposed amendments.

14. Mrs. de ARMAS GARCÍA (Cuba) suggested that action should first be taken on the amendment orally proposed by the representative of Pakistan. With regard to the statement made by the representative of Canada, she said that her delegation was open to all proposals.

15. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that he had been hurt by the ideological arrogance of the Canadian statement. The principles of democracy and good governance reflected in the Koran and the Islamic Sharia had preceded by 1,400 years the formulation of human rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and he was not prepared to accept that they were any less relevant than those reflected in the draft resolution. The representative of Canada had said that the proposed amendment was a very specific reference to one particular system. However, the tenth and twelfth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution made specific references to particular democratic systems. While he was prepared to discuss his amendment, he urged the Commission to give it serious consideration.

16. Ms. GLOVER (United Kingdom) said that the draft resolution was not prescriptive except insofar as it called upon States to consolidate democracy. Extensive consultations had been held on the text, which had been considerably modified in order to incorporate changes that had been proposed. The written amendments proposed in E/CN.4/2000/L.58 sought to remove all substance from the draft resolution and undermine democracy. The sponsors of the revised draft resolution had incorporated all the proposals they considered compatible with the purposes of that text and had acted in good faith and in a transparent manner. It was unfortunate that the representative of Pakistan had not proposed his amendment, at an earlier stage. She urged him to withdraw his amendment and said that, if he did not do so, her delegation would vote against it.

17. Mr. KOH (United States of America) said that the draft resolution made no specific reference to any particular religion: it was not necessary to do so, as all religions were already recognized in the first preambular paragraph, while the rich and diverse nature of the community of the world's democracies had been recognized in resolution 1999/57.

18. Mr. SUN Ang (China), speaking as a sponsor of the written amendments to the draft resolution, said that he supported the amendment proposed by the representative of Pakistan. It was surprising that the United States, with its vaunted enthusiasm for a diversity of cultures, should oppose the amendment on the grounds of Pakistan's national circumstances.

19. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) said that, since Bangladesh was a democratic and pluralist society, his delegation was supporting the draft resolution. His country also, however, drew much of its inspiration from the Koran. His delegation would also support the amendment proposed by the representative of Pakistan, which would add value to the draft resolution.

20. Mr. MAXIM (Romania) said he was surprised that the representative of Pakistan had not introduced the proposed amendment during the weeks when the draft resolution was being formulated. It was obviously an attempt to delay a decision on the matter.

21. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that the proposed amendment reflected the importance his delegation attached to the draft resolution. He suggested a short suspension of the meeting to enable a text to be agreed upon.

The meeting was suspended at 11.05 a.m. and resumed at 11.20 a.m.

22. Mr. MAXIM (Romania) said that agreement had been reached on the following text for a new preambular paragraph which had been accepted by the sponsors:

"Recognizing and respecting the rich and diverse nature of the community of the world's democracies, which arise out of all of the world's social, cultural and religious beliefs and traditions,"

23. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, before proceeding to the vote on the revised draft resolution (E/CN.4/2000/L.45/Rev.1), the Commission should take action on the proposed amendments to the draft resolution (E/CN.4/2000/L.58), with some paragraphs being considered separately, as the representative of Cuba had requested.

24. It was so decided.

Amendment to draft resolution E/CN.4/2000/L.45 on promoting and consolidating democracy (E/CN.4/2000/L.58)

25. At the request of the representative of Cuba, separate votes were taken by roll-call on paragraph 1, paragraph 4, paragraph 5, paragraph 7 and paragraphs 2, 6, 9 and 14-17 of the amendment (E/CN.4/2000/L.58).

Paragraph 1

26. Germany, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bhutan, China, Congo, Cuba, Mexico, Pakistan, Qatar, Rwanda, Sudan, Swaziland.

Against: Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Nepal, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bangladesh, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Venezuela, Zambia.

27. Paragraph 1 of the amendment was rejected by 22 votes to 10, with 20 abstentions.

Paragraph 4

28. Canada, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bhutan, China, Congo, Cuba, Mexico, Pakistan, Qatar, Rwanda, Sudan, Swaziland, Zambia.

Against: Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Nepal, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bangladesh, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Venezuela.

29. Paragraph 4 of the amendment was rejected by 23 votes to 11, with 18 abstentions.

Paragraph 5

30. Cuba, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Argentina, Bhutan, China, Congo, Cuba, Mexico, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sudan, Swaziland, Zambia.

Against: Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Nepal, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bangladesh, Burundi, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Venezuela.

31. Paragraph 5 of the amendment was rejected by 22 votes to 13, with 18 abstentions.

Paragraph 7

32. The Philippines, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Guatemala, Mexico, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Venezuela, Zambia.

Against: Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Nepal, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Burundi, Ecuador, El Salvador, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Tunisia.

33. Paragraph 7 of the amendment was rejected by 22 votes to 17, with 14 abstentions.

34. At the request of the representative of Cuba, a vote was taken by roll-call on paragraphs 2, 6, 9 and 14-17 of the amendment to the draft resolution.

35. Spain, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bhutan, China, Congo, Cuba, Pakistan, Qatar, Rwanda, Sudan.

Against: Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Swaziland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bangladesh, Burundi, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Niger, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Venezuela, Zambia.

36. Paragraphs 2, 6, 9 and 14-17 of the amendment were rejected by 29 votes to 8, with 16 abstentions.

37. Ms. KUNADI (India) said that her Government firmly supported the values and principles of democratic governance. Democracy was the best guarantor of human rights, as well as the only acceptable form of government. At the national level, it was thanks to democracy that political stability had been achieved in her country and that different elements in society had found expression.

38. Her delegation had become a sponsor of the draft resolution out of the conviction that the promotion of democracy was essential to the realization of all human rights and fundamental freedoms. While all peoples should have the right freely to determine their own political and legal systems, such systems should be in accordance with the fundamental values and principles of democracy and the rule of law. The draft resolution was a timely one given the spread of democratic ideas, which nonetheless remained under threat from various quarters.

39. Some of the proposed amendments to the draft resolution (E/CN.4/2000/L.58) were based on agreed language contained elsewhere, but they were not necessarily either relevant or

necessary. Other amendments were clearly unacceptable. Her delegation had accordingly abstained on some of the proposed amendments and had voted against others.

40. Mrs. de ARMAS GARCÍA (Cuba) said that certain delegations should be aware that they had voted against language used in the Charter of the United Nations and the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action.

41. Speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, she said that the promotion and consolidation of democracy involved a variety of systems. As had been recognized in General Assembly resolutions, inter alia, no universal model for democracy existed which would suit all peoples equally well, since political systems were subject to distinct political, historical, cultural and religious factors. Moreover, electoral processes were a matter for the internal jurisdiction of States and an expression of their political sovereignty. It was for individual nations to establish their own institutions, and political and legislative systems.

42. It would be inappropriate to attempt, by means of a resolution, to codify a model of democracy for all States. It was also questionable whether such a model was necessary, given that the Charter and numerous other international instruments had already established the basic principles on which diverse democratic systems could be built. Such diversity not only enriched the international community; it was the raison d'être of the United Nations. Her delegation was thus unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

43. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that no single model for democracy met the requirements of all peoples and nations. Some democracies functioned well, while others tolerated and even served as a breeding ground for corruption, inequality and racism. Not only was the draft resolution overly prescriptive, it also reflected a particular ideological posture, and even a certain "cultural arrogance".

44. Islam could boast its own system of democracy. Principles of democracy and good governance were enshrined in the Koran and Sharia and had been put into practice for over 1,400 years. His delegation could not, therefore, endorse a draft resolution which, by implication, called into question the very legitimacy of such basic principles. His delegation was, however, gratified that a new preambular paragraph had been included which recognized democratic systems arising out of the world's social, cultural and religious beliefs and traditions.

45. Commenting on the voting on the proposed amendments (E/CN.4/2000/L.58), he said that his delegation had been greatly concerned that an "automatic majority" in the Commission had rejected a series of amendments embodying the language of the Charter and other international instruments. That outcome was deeply regrettable. In the interests of the pursuit of power and influence, the Commission had compromised the basis on which States participated in the work of the United Nations.

46. Mr. RODRÍGUEZ CEDEÑO (Venezuela) said that his Government supported any process which sought to define democracy. At the previous session, in sponsoring resolution E/1999/57 on the right to democracy, his delegation had hoped to initiate a process for defining a fundamental right for all citizens, which the international community should recognize. The current draft resolution (E/CN.4/2000/L.45/Rev.1) must be understood in terms

of the sharing of common concepts and ideals to be cultivated within different cultures and historical processes, not as a series of uniform and binding rules. A draft resolution on democracy should not be a source of division. His delegation looked forward to continuing to participate in the process of defining the concept of democracy.

47. Mr. SIDDIG (Sudan) said that each nation and group of nations had the right to preserve its cultural, political and economic specificities. Each Government also had the right to implement policies which best served its people's aspirations. Indeed, experience had shown that democratic systems could not necessarily be transposed from one culture to another, but must be applied in a manner tailored to individual societies. There was no universally successful blueprint for democracy. Since the draft resolution reflected only one example of a democratic system, his delegation intended to abstain from voting upon it.

48. After a discussion in which Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan), Mr. DE AGUIAR PATRIOTA (Brazil), Mr. FERNÁNDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba), Mr. HYNES (Canada) and Mrs. de ARMAS GARCÍA (Cuba) took part, it was agreed that although - under rule 60 of the rules of procedure - sponsors must not speak in explanation of vote, they could be allowed to make general statements.

49. Mr. SALINAS (Chile) said that the promotion, consolidation and defence of democracy was an essential element of his Government's foreign and domestic policies. His delegation had the utmost respect for the historical, cultural and religious contexts in which democracy was applied and developed. The revised draft resolution (E/CN.4/2000/L.45/Rev.1) reflected the essential and universally applicable elements of democracy which constituted the foundations for the rule of law in any State.

50. Speaking in explanation of his delegation's votes on the proposed amendments (E/CN.4/2000/L.58), he said that they introduced elements which distorted the spirit and the letter of the draft resolution. By voting against them, his delegation had not rejected any of the fundamental principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations or other international instruments. It was his delegation's belief that the draft resolution contributed to the evolution of international law and the consolidation of democracy.

51. Mr. ZIMKOVIC (Office of the High Commissioner) said that the draft resolution had no financial implications.

52. Mr. SUN Ang (China) said that there could be no development or modernization without democracy. All countries were duty-bound to follow the will of their people by establishing a democratic system. There was, however, no universal blueprint for democracy. All Governments were entitled - in the light of their national conditions - to determine their own political, economic and social development and their own specific means of achieving democracy. Moreover, in promoting democracy, it was important to respect the different stages of development and the cultural, traditional and historical backgrounds of the various countries.

53. The draft resolution (E/CN.4/2000/L.45/Rev.1) failed to reflect fully the views of his delegation which would accordingly abstain in the voting on it.

54. Mr. MAMBA (Swaziland) said that most of the elements of the draft resolution were enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. His delegation would thus be voting in favour of it. However, it wished to register its reservations concerning paragraph 1, subparagraph (d) (ii), which was overly prescriptive. The concept of "multiple parties" was not provided for in international human rights instruments, and his Government would not be bound by elements that had not been universally agreed. There were, indeed, many ways of achieving the democratic ideal.

55. Mr. DESPOUY (Argentina) said that his delegation would support the draft resolution, since it was designed to achieve a degree of consensus on the common value of democracy. He proposed that consideration of the draft resolution be deferred, however, in the hope that a consensus text could be achieved whereby some of the amendments proposed by the delegation of Cuba might be taken into account.

56. Mrs. de ARMAS GARCÍA (Cuba) said that there was no single, universal model of democracy that was applicable throughout the world; it was for peoples themselves to determine their own democratic system. Diversity was of the essence of the United Nations, and as such was reflected in its Charter and many of its instruments. It was neither appropriate nor necessary to try to establish a single model to be followed by all Member States, and her delegation would not be voting in favour of the draft resolution.

57. At the request of the representative of Romania, a vote was taken by roll-call on the draft resolution.

58. The Philippines, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Argentina, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Czech Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Germany, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bhutan, China, Congo, Cuba, Pakistan, Qatar, Rwanda, Sudan.

59. The draft resolution was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

RACISM, RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, XENOPHOBIA AND ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION (agenda item 6) (continued) (E/CN.4/2000/2-E/CN.4/Sub.2/1999/54, chapter I, draft decision 1)

Draft decision 1 on the rights of non-citizens, recommended by the Sub-Commission (E/CN.4/2000/2-E/CN.4/Sub.2/1999/54, chapter I)

60. Mr. ZIVKOVIC (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights), outlining the financial implications of the draft decision, said that the activities envisaged were two trips to Geneva, in 2000 and 2001, for consultations at an estimated cost of US$ 13,100. No provisions had been included in the Programme Budget for the current biennium 2000-2001 to cover those activities. The potential for absorption, as well as any additional resources, would be included in the final Programme Budget implication statement to be submitted to the Economic and Social Council at its forthcoming session in the context of its review of the report by the Commission on its fifty-sixth session.

61. Ms. GLOVER (United Kingdom) said that, following consultations with all regional groups, she had an amendment to propose that would bring the draft decision into line with the language used in other draft decisions recommended by the Sub-Commission. The last sentence of the draft decision should read: "The Council requests the Secretary-General to provide within existing resources the Special Rapporteur with all the assistance necessary to enable him/her to accomplish this task."

62. The proposed amendment was adopted.

63. Draft decision 1 recommended by the Sub-Commission, as orally amended, was adopted.

SPECIFIC GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS:

(a) MIGRANT WORKERS

(b) MINORITIES

(c) MASS EXODUSES AND DISPLACED PERSONS

(d) OTHER VULNERABLE GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS

(agenda item 14) (continued) (E/CN.4/2000/L.56, L.57, L.64 and L.67)

Draft resolution on human rights of migrants (E/CN.4/2000/L.56)

64. Mr. NEGRIN MUÑOZ (Mexico), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, said that a change had been made to the thirteenth preambular paragraph, which should read: "Bearing in mind the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants contained in its resolution 1999/44 of 27 April 1999".

65. Mrs. IZE-CHARRIN (Secretary of the Commission) said that the representative of Indonesia had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

66. The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted.

Draft resolution on the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (E/CN.4/2000/L.57)

67. Mr. NEGRIN MUÑOZ (Mexico), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, said that it was similar to the one the Commission had adopted without a vote at its fifty-fifth session.

68. The draft resolution was adopted.

Draft resolution on tolerance and pluralism as indivisible elements in the promotion and protection of human rights (E/CN.4/2000/L.64)

69. Ms. KUNADI (India), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, said that a new second preambular paragraph should be added to read: "Recalling also the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations". In paragraph 5 (c), the word "practice" should be "practices".

70. The draft resolution reflected the fact that, in a multi-ethnic, multi-religious and multicultural world, no society was beyond the dangers posed by the absence of tolerance. Tolerance and pluralism together strengthened democracy and facilitated the full enjoyment of all human rights, thereby constituting a sound foundation for civil society, social harmony and peace. The main focus of the draft resolution was on strengthening promotional activities that facilitated the enjoyment of all human rights, especially the promotion of tolerance. She hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

71. Mrs. IZE-CHARRIN (Secretary of the Commission) said that the representatives of Argentina, Pakistan and the Philippines and the observers for Georgia, Israel and the Ukraine had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

72. The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted.

Draft resolution on the human rights of persons with disabilities (E/CN.4/2000/L.67)

73. Mr. MAC AODHA (Observer for Ireland), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, said that it recalled the continuing isolation and exclusion of persons with disabilities, especially children and women and persons with developmental and psychiatric disabilities. It reflected the great concern of many in the international community that persons with disabilities continued to be marginalized and excluded from the mainstream of society. Their treatment came fully within the human rights agenda.

74. He drew attention to two operative paragraphs in particular, one inviting the High Commissioner for Human Rights, in cooperation with the Special Rapporteur on disability

of the Commission for Social Development, to examine measures to strengthen the protection and monitoring of the human rights of persons with disabilities and to solicit input and proposals from interested parties, and the other inviting multilateral development agencies, in the light of the Standard Rules, to pay due regard to the question of access and related disability rights issues in connection with the projects they sponsored and funded. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

75. Mrs. IZE-CHARRIN (Secretary of the Commission) said that the representatives of Bangladesh, Mauritius and Pakistan, and the observers for Equatorial Guinea, Israel, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Uruguay had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

76. Mr. ZIVKOVIC (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights), outlining the financial implications of the draft resolution, said that the cost of the invitation to the Special Rapporteur of the Commission for Social Development to address the Commission on Human Rights at its fifty-eighth session would be US$ 3,200, and that the relevant provisions would be included in the proposed Programme Budget for the biennium 2002-2003.

77. The draft resolution was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.